A U M

Concentration is the continual staying of the soul in the pure Eternal at all times, and not the caressing of imaginations. —CREST JEWEL OF WISDOM.

THEOSOPHY

Vol. XXV May, 1937 No. 7

H. P. B.—THE DIRECT AGENT

THOSE who, from years given to study of the writings of H. P. Blavatsky, regard her as in fact the agent and messenger of a body of Perfected Men, must inevitably feel great sorrow that her character is so misconceived, her purpose so misunderstood by the great majority of men. But there are also a few who have some perception of the real nature of H. P. B., and who strive to increase the scope of that perception. In this there is hope and encouragement.

What is sometimes not realized is that the reception accorded to Theosophy by the world and the treatment which its Messenger received are but verifications of the philosophy itself. Only ignorance of the most elementary of its teachings could lead to the opinion that the "Millennium" is destined soon to come about through a wide acceptance of Theosophical principles, as such. If human evolution can proceed only by "self-induced and self-devised efforts," and "Lower *Manas* is still bound by Desire, which is the preponderating principle at the present period," it should be evident that the "mass" reaction to Theosophy has but illustrated the operation of human nature which its doctrines describe. Let us remember that the mission of 1875 took advantage of an opportunity to reach "the *developing* intelligence of the race." Theosophy is for all, but that few would avail themselves of this great gift was clearly foreseen by H. P. B. In the preface to *Isis Unveiled*, the first of her works submitted to public judgment, she enumerated the various classes that would array themselves against Theosophy:

> The Christians, who will see that we question the evidences of the genuineness of their faith.

> The Scientists, who will find their pretensions placed in the same bundle with those of the Roman Catholic Church for infallibility, and, in certain particulars, the sages and philosophers of the ancient world classed higher than they.
>
> Pseudo-Scientists will, of course, denounce us furiously.
>
> Broad Churchmen and Freethinkers will find that we do not accept what they do, but demand recognition of the whole truth.
>
> Men of letters and various *authorities,* who hide their real belief in deference to popular prejudices.
>
> The mercenaries and parasites of the Press, who prostitute its more than royal power, and dishonor a noble profession, will find it easy to mock at things too wonderful for them to understand; for to them the price of a paragraph is more than the value of sincerity. From many will come honest criticism; from many—cant. But we look to the future.

In the sixty years since these lines were penned the Theosophical cause has suffered repeated attacks from all the quarters listed. In the early days of the Movement the warfare raged in the arena of public thought. As the cycle ran its course the same sort of objection and criticism found expression in the human nature of theosophists themselves. Today there are many who call themselves students of Theosophy, yet who exhibit the same blind faith in latter-day "theosophical" revelation that orthodox Christians show for their religious dogmas. Others, whose thinking bears a theosophical tinge, fail to *study* H. P. B. and place greater confidence in the infallibility of scientific authority than in her cogent appeals to their individual reason—the very mental laziness against which she warned. Even devoted students are sometimes aghast to find in themselves evidence of "mental reservations" which, were they allowed to develop, would lead logically to one or more of the various positions assumed by those whom H. P. B. characterized as *enemies* to Theosophy.

The most effective dodge in human nature's extensive repertoire of self-deception is the convenient excuse that to renounce what mental reservations one may hold with regard to the truth of Theosophy and the genuineness of H. P. B. as a Messenger from the Masters, would be to believe blindly—to fall into the same error that has undermined the moral value of all the great religions of the past. And were this a true statement of the case, no argument could be more valid. Honest doubts and healthy scepticism, followed by a testing of Theosophical ideas in the field of personal experience are a most natural, almost a necessary precedent to the study of a previously unfamiliar system of thought. "Mental reservations" so

defined constitute the true scientific spirit, which accepts as true only that which has been rationally demonstrated, each one for himself. Theosophical history has yet to show that one who conscientiously followed this path came finally to reject as erroneous a single conception taught by Theosophy, or to regard with doubt the authenticity of H. P. Blavatsky as the authorized bearer of the Wisdom-Religion to the world of the nineteenth century.

Held in the white light of impartial examination, the reservations which lead to a disvowal of these ideas are always seen to be a personal unwillingness to *apply* those doctrines conceded to be true. Illustrations of this fact abound in history, Theosophical and otherwise. Take, for example, the simple principle of Impersonality as the first requisite for successful Theosophical work. H. P. B. gave forceful expression to this principle in her Third Message to the American Theosophists:

> But let no man set up a popery instead of Theosophy, as this would be suicidal and has ever ended most fatally. We are all fellow-students, more or less advanced; but no one belonging to the Theosophical Society ought to count himself as more than, at best, a pupil-teacher—one who has no right to dogmatize.

Can anyone question the truth of this statement? Yet we have only to look about to see that "popery" best describes more than one "theosophic" body of the present day. Is this because of a "scientific" unwillingness to accept a principle which the testimony of history makes axiomatic? The simple fact is that the desire to be a "leader," to have personal following, was allowed to set aside and finally to reject entirely the only means by which any real service to the race could be performed. Not only this, but the policies adopted led countless thousands to think that the dilute effusions and mystic jargon presented as Theosophy to an unknowing public bore the same relation to the Masters of Wisdom as the doctrines of H. P. B.—or, that they were literal improvements over Madame Blavatsky's work and the latter might now be discarded, even with benefit.

To suggest either directly or by implication that the accredited Agent of the Masters of Wisdom and the writings left by Her have been superseded by the works of alleged "successors" is to claim for the latter a still greater measure of understanding. Such claims are always accompanied by deprecatory references to H. P. B., ranging from a faint and condescending praise to general and specific derogation and condemnation. Obviously, unless an actual comparison is made of the work of H. P. B. with the pretensions of her "successors" there is little opportunity for such bald perversions to be dis-

covered, for the apathy of human nature is such that the mere presence of spurious doctrine rarely arouses the misled to look for the true. It was *Theosophy* which enabled innumerable men and women to throw off the stupefying influence of religious dogmatism. There is no cure for pseudo-Theosophy except a knowledge of the genuine teaching—this, or the long, long path of bitter experience.

What so many fail to recognize is that either the Theosophy of H. P. B. is a body of knowledge which is entirely self-consistent, or it is all false. It cannot be regarded in the same light as the body of scientific fact and theory. If one discovers faults and errors in a scientific hypothesis, this in no way prejudges other theories of science which have not so been found wrong. The student of science is, or should be aware from the first that this is a precise definition of the *working hypothesis* of the scientific method. Its basic assumptions always include the possibility of error. Theosophy, on the other hand, postulates itself as a unified system of unqualified truth. A doctrine which asserts itself to be the knowledge of Perfected Men who are possessed of all knowledge relating to this solar system would be self-contradictory on any other premise. Thus, the character and mission of H. P. Blavatsky are an organic part of her philosophy. To cast the shadow of doubt upon her unique position in the "working hypothesis" of Theosophy is to destroy the very substance of that which we would test. One need not blindly believe in the credentials of H. P. B., nor in those she gave us with respect to the position of her colleague and co-worker, William Q. Judge. The great error lies in the assumption that H. P. B. could have been *both* right and wrong, that the Masters could have permitted mis-statements of hers to pass uncorrected — allowed their teachings to be misrepresented to humanity. Were this possible they could not be Masters. If her Masters are *not* Perfected Men, Theosophy is a hoax, the study of which is a waste of time. And, we may add, if it is a waste of time to study the philosophy which formed the basis of the teachings of such men as Buddha, Plato and Christ, life is not worth living.

What, then, is the fitting attitude of mind with which to examine the teachings of Theosophy—the life work of H. P. Blavatsky? If we would study the doctrines *She* brought, it is but common sense to observe the conditions which she prescribed. In the early pages of *The Secret Doctrine* H. P. B. set down the few fundamental conceptions which form the philosophical basis of the system in its entirety. "On their clear apprehension," she wrote, "depends the understanding of all that follows." After the presentation of these ideas

is the statement that "Once the reader has gained a clear comprehension of them and realized the light which they throw on every problem of life, they will need no further justification in his eyes, because their truth will be to him as evident as the sun in heaven."

To a world bewildered to distraction by claims and counter-claims of a thousand and one prophets and *soi-disant* saviors, so clear and unequivocal a means of verification of the truth of Theosophy should be a welcome opportunity. Yet even among theosophists are to be found many who, in spite of years of alleged devotion, confess an ignorance of the very existence of these fundamental propositions!

If Theosophy can be verified only through study and application, then either the common sense or the sincerity of all those who find time or inclination to criticize or minimize the work of H. P. B. is open to serious question. If Theosophy has been made a means to personal achievement by ambitious plagiarists and imitators, then honest inquirers would do well to look into the *source* of so generous a fountain of knowledge.

There have been many "biographers," theosophical and otherwise, of H. P. B. Each has endeavored to present a picture of that amazing character who so puzzled the world in the last quarter of the last century—each according to his understanding and his purpose.. None of them did more than disclose his own limitations, prejudice and bias, whether religious, scientific or personal. She stands still unmeasured, unknown—save for that degree of understanding which may be felt in the hearts of those tempest-tossed mariners on the sea of life who have seen and been guided by the beacon-ray which was the gift she left to all, and which they *know* to be utterly dependable.

Only time can show to the world at large—time and the persevering efforts of true Theosophists—how great was the injustice done to H. P. B. by the errant human nature that She came to elevate. For the present, we can only repeat the sacramental phrase we have from one of *Her* teachers—

> "Those who cannot understand her had best not try to explain her; those who do not find themselves strong enough for the task she outlined from the very first had best not attempt it."

GENETIC YEARS

FOR one who assumes the position of a voluntary recruit in the sadly decimated ranks of the Theosophical Movement, resolving to add his strength and life's devotion to the scattered few who carry on that Work for which their Predecessors strove, there is much in the present scene to be likened to the "survey of the armies" described in the first chapter of *The Bhagavad-Gita*. Anguished humanity—blind, helpless hulk with no choice but to be guided by the Duryodhanas of modern thought—now re-enacts the role of Dhritarashtra. A thousand thousand Sanjayas are engaged in recounting for the impotent king the mobilizing forces of the coming struggle, from pulpit, lecture hall and press. Meanwhile the Kuru generals on the field of battle are driven by their knowledge of the fortunes of war to acknowledge over and over again that their armies are "not sufficient," but seeing as well that the "principles of their nature" will impel them to engage.

Never was there a time when among the leaders of men pessimism was so rampant as today. Never in our history have the hopes expressed for the future been so transparently baseless as now. And as a logical accompaniment to the neurasthenia of modern life, the frantic efforts of those who account themselves the responsible guides of our civilization are matched only by the chaos of their failure on every hand. John J. O'Neil, writing in the New York *Herald-Tribune* (Sept. 20, 1936), makes apt illustration of the condition of society: "Knowledge," he suggests, "is running wild like a cancer"—"a group of normal cells in the body that have thrown off the normal growth control restraints which keep each part of the body in a state in which it will best co-operate with every other part of the body."

> The scientist [he says] gathers knowledge for its own sake and is not affected in his pursuit of this knowledge by the fact that his discoveries may have extremely important and far-reaching immediate effects on human welfare, or the alternative situation that they may lie unused for months, years, decades or even centuries.
>
> Our whole present power and machine age civilization has been built on the discoveries of the scientists, and the scientist has a responsibility to the remainder of civilization, whether he desires it or not.

The full measure of this responsibility has yet to be realized in scientific thought. For several generations our leading educators have urged that life be put upon a "scientific basis," that humanity should adopt a philosophy consistent with scientific theory and values. A consideration of the aims and ends of most men shows that this is precisely what has happened. Theoretically, science is engaged in the search for truth. Practically, it is employed to produce mere physical prosperity, the ideal of the machine age. Civilization but mirrors the practical ideal held up to it by science. Perceiving the social conflicts which have arisen from this misdirection of human intelligence, science, in the capacity of spectator, concludes there is little hope for mankind. Dr. Raymond Pearl of Johns Hopkins compares the present tendencies in the human race to the suicidal migration of the lemmings (New York *Herald-Tribune,* Dec. 30, 1936):

> One scarcely envisages mankind marching to a watery grave just behind a horde of frantic lemmings. But does any one find it difficult to conceive of men marching off in the not too distant future to a war? Or to doubt that, once well started, that war will entangle in its meshes the major portion of mankind before it is finished? Or, finally, to doubt that the next world war will achieve a destructiveness hitherto undreamed of in the wildest flight of imagination?

With a rare impartiality the noted biologist discusses this impending mass suicide as a logical sequence of nature. An explosively sudden growth of population, he says, always results in crowding which leads to mass reactions and finally to mass destruction. He further observes—

> . . . no insignificant part of the governmental policies imposed upon their bewildered populations by Nazi Germany, Soviet Russia and Fascist Italy are direct, conscious and overt applications to mankind of what are held to be sound inferences from experimental work with lower organisms in the field of Mendelian genetics.
>
> The phenomenon itself shows that politicians are just as ready and eager to turn the results of experimental laboratory research as anything else to their own ends, in the pursuit of their "endless adventure," the gaining and holding of power over their fellow men in the name of government.

That it should have been from the first the duty of science to devise a system of control over the use of its knowledge seems never to occur.

A physician writing in the Los Angeles *Times* (Feb. 3) demands state laws to provide living human material for "scientific experimentation." Admitting that "at present we rely too much on animal experimentation and deduction by analogy," he suggests that the "Thousands of men and women now rotting in prison should have the privilege of volunteering as subjects for scientific experimentation—and suitable recognition for this service to society or mankind should be accorded such convicts—say a reduction of the term of imprisonment." It is wrong, he says, to use volunteers for such purposes "when lives of comparatively little value are available in prisons everywhere."

It is easy to see how quickly this reasoning might be employed in several European states to justify the vivisection of political offenders—men regarded as far greater enemies to society than mere criminals. From a coldly materialistic point of view, there is ample logic to support the practice of human vivisection. If men are but a kind of animal and if some men are better dead than alive, why should they not be employed as living laboratories for the enhancement of scientific understanding? A Chicago biologist (New York *Herald-Tribune,* Dec. 27, 1936) has caused much comment by the successful transplantation of the legs of a salamander so that the tiny animal walked backward every time it tried to go forward. There seems to be a general agreement that such experiments add to the wisdom of the race! Why should pure science fail to use outcast human subjects because of merely sentimental considerations?

Harold Laski, Professor of Political Science at the University of London, calls the world "the lunatic asylum of the planets." (New York *Herald-Tribune,* March 20.) In Europe, he says,

> . . . you can smell the explosive in the air. It's like 1913 all over again. The League of Nations is a dead issue, at least until we've fought the next war to end war.
>
> People, and even their governments, do not want war, but war is rooted in the system. Nations make demands, and then they arm. Armaments beget fears, and fears beget suspicions. Then follow incidents, a challenge, and then the fighting. It is a chain of relentless logic, just as in 1914.

A recent bulletin of the Bureau for Business Research of Berlin reports that in 1936 the nations of the world spent fourteen billions of dollars on armaments, as compared with a total of four billion spent in 1913. According to the Philadelphia *Inquirer* (March 7):

> In those days 4 per cent of a nation's total industrial production was considered a big expenditure for war preparedness. In 1936 the average was 11 per cent.
>
> Russia alone spent 12½ per cent of its national income on armaments last year, compared with only 2 per cent in 1928. The United States was the only big nation showing a relatively small ratio, ours being 1½ per cent for 1936 as against 1 per cent for 1928.
>
> The civil war in Spain, actually, has been in many ways a proving ground for the inventions of that group of scientists—chemists, metallurgists, engineers of every sort—who have dedicated themselves to the business of devising new deviltries for dealing out destruction and death.

The writer finds solace in the "axiom of scientists that for every engine of destruction devised by man, science has been immediately able to develop an adequate means of defense." History would seem to indicate otherwise.

Among the scientists who have felt the need of some sort of moral doctrine is Professor Arthur H. Compton of the University of Chicago. In a sermon preached to students in the university chapel (New York *Times,* May 25, 1936) he suggests that "advances in science are gradually shifting responsibility for evolution of life on earth from the hands of God to the shoulders of mankind." Until about four thousand years ago "God held in his hands the whole responsibility for evolution upon this planet." Then came the dawn of "social conscience." But the responsibility of man, he says, is not yet complete:

> Considering the many obvious errors that we are making, we may be thankful that we do not yet have complete control. Yet who can fail to respond to the opportunity and challenge that are before us of working with the God of the Universe in carrying through that final stage of making this a suitable world, and ourselves a suitable race for what is perhaps the supreme position of intelligent life in His world?
>
> If men are to reach a satisfying life as masters of machines, it cannot be by fighting against "a brave, new world." Those who are part of the mechanized world must adapt themselves to it or perish. It is toward the mechanized communities that we must look to find the most rapid adaptation of our thought and custom.
>
> The educational institutions in our mechanized Chicagos are those toward which men look for leadership in the changing world. A surprisingly large share of the responsibility for carry-

> ing through a major program of the God of the Universe rests upon the shoulders of those present in this audience.
>
> If indeed the creation of intelligent persons is a major objective of the Creator of the Universe, and if, as we have reason to surmise, mankind is now in his highest development in this direction, the opportunity and responsibility of working as God's partners in His great task are almost overwhelming. What nobler ambition can one have than to cooperate with his Maker in bringing about a better world?

This is Professor Compton's solution. He attempts a synthesis of science and religion by combining the worst errors of each!

Professor Julian Huxley, grandson of Thomas Huxley, thinks that the way out may lie in the training of psychological powers like mental telepathy. Such extra-sensory faculties, he says, "might be developed until they were as commonly distributed as, say, musical or mathematical gifts are today." (New York *Times,* Sept. 9, 1936.) He does, however, make one observation which is as percipient as that of his illustrious grandfather, who suggested that there must be beings which transcend the present development of humanity as we do the black beetle. He speaks of the struggle in progress "between the idea of purpose directed to a future life and one directed to the existing world," concluding that "until such major conflicts are resolved, humanity can have no single major purpose and progress can be but fitful and slow." Strange to say, Professor Huxley's remarks are innocent of any endeavor to pursue this problem to its solution.

Dr. Oscar Riddle is quoted in the New York *Times* (Dec. 10, 1936) as asserting that "the time has come for man to direct his own biological destiny." He would apply genetics "to control human evolution and give us a type something better than a Buddha, Newton, Goethe, and Lincoln rolled into one." In this we have what is perhaps a rather extravagant interpretation of Dr. Riddle's plan, yet one which he could hardly reject as an ideal. That the heredity of most great men offers little or nothing to explain their genius, and that teachers such as Buddha suggested methods wholly different from those of modern eugenic theory for the attainment of their high state, are facts which men like Dr. Riddle consistently ignore; and, as the *Times* editorial writer points out:

> Suppose we entrust the task of directing human evolution to the geneticists because of their expert knowledge of heredity. They would be no safer guides than the directors of today. . . . . Major Leonard Darwin, head of the eugenic movement in

> England, is equally sure that the "upper classes" of his country should rule the earth. Lenz, a distinguished German geneticist, is all for the blond Nordic. And those who hold that the possession of wealth is an evidence of ability and therefore of social fitness would shed no tear if those who rail at the rich were sterilized. Give us a ruling class, whether it be composed of capitalists, Communists, scientists or old-fashioned democratic liberals, and it is sure to create the Perfect Social Man in its own image.

Professor Harold C. Brown of Stanford University prescribes three virtues essential to the survival of modern society—"the disposition to speak the truth, conscientiousness in fulfilling agreement and a regard for the welfare of others." (New York *Times*, Dec. 31, 1936.) In these the educator suggests moral principles as old as the sands of time, for which modern science can hardly take credit. He speaks deprecatingly of moral training in the home and the school. These agencies, he says, build up "a code of ethics unsuited to the modern way of life":

> . . .if there is anything to be learned from the teachings of modern psychology, the data of the anthropologist, or the records of history, it is that the morally good man can only be brought into being by first building a social order that will reward instead of penalize him for the practice of virtues.

It is somewhat curious that although the monumental failure of science has been in its effort to introduce morality to the uses of its techniques, Professor Brown insists that the traditional methods of moral instruction taught by every great religious reformer should be discharged and the hypothesis of modern psychology, the scientific character of which is gravely questioned by many, be applied for this purpose. His idea illustrates the complete inversion of truth in the scientific theory of evolution. The latter regards the human being as a mere creature of his environment. Thus, as organized society is regarded as being the greatest single influence upon the individual, moral training must arise out of its conditions.

Such instances of intellectual and moral confusion could be multiplied *ad infinitum*. Regarded collectively, they are but the indicia of the time—the "age of transition" spoken of in *The Ocean of Theosophy*. From one point of view, the horrors we see are the dark record of degeneration—the dying agonies of an old order. The rapid accumulation of evil tendencies is clearly explained by W. Q. Judge:

> . . .the ignoble example becomes a precedent; other cases of a like nature follow in quick succession. In the course of time,

> (just when a sad descending cycle begins, such is the divine intelligence of the law that economizes energies and makes things fit it), the leading of the ideal family life becomes almost impossible and very rare; the whole community is thus ruined. Learned and great adepts retire to other spheres (where there then is an ascending cycle) and leave the nation to be swallowed by a cataclysm after ages of degradation and vice.

But as every death presages a better and higher birth, let us, as Mr. Judge suggests, reverse the case:

> ...suppose that in the most degenerate nation, in the darkest of cycles, one philanthropist becomes unselfish and intelligent enough to set a noble and intelligent example by fulfilling all family duties; then, as naturally as in the preceding case, the precedent gradually gains acceptance; the way is paved for the advent of an ascending cycle; Gnanis bless the noble man and come down from other unfavorable spheres, where descending cycles begin to dawn.

For the Companions working in the world, making their survey of the armies, it is difficult to see the hopeful signs. But even in "the darkest of cycles" it is well to remember that all births begin on higher planes, that there may be many more nascent Arjunas than we know of, who will rally to the banner of truth—when the hour strikes.

FOREVER ONWARD

The periodical rise and fall of human character on the external planes takes place now, as it did before, and the ordinary average of man is too weak to see that both processes occur each time on a higher plane than the preceding. But as such changes are not always the work of centuries, for often extreme changes are wrought by swift acting forces—*e.g.*, by wars, speculations, epidemics, the devastation of famines or religious fanaticism—therefore, do the blind masses imagine that man ever was, is, and will be the same. To the eyes of us, moles, mankind is like our globe —seemingly stationary. And yet, both move in space and time with an equal velocity, around themselves and—onward.

—H. P. BLAVATSKY.

THE SYMBOLIC CHRIST

II

CHRISTMAS Day, the 25th of December, is celebrated in the Christian world as the birthday of Jesus the Christ. It was also reverenced throughout the entire pagan world as the birthday of various gods. At the first moment after midnight of the 24th of December nearly all the nations of the earth, as if by common consent, celebrated the labor of the "Queen of Heaven" and the birth of *Sol,* the Sun. In ancient Egypt this day was the birthday of both Osiris and Horus, and in Persia, of Mithras. In Greece it commemorated the birth of Hercules, Bacchus and Adonis, as acknowledged by Tertullian, Jerome and other Christian Fathers. The ancient Germans celebrated their Yule-feast at the time of the winter solstice. In Scandinavia the *Jul-feast* was held at the same time, when friends exchanged presents. In Rome a festival took place on the 25th of December, called the *Natalis Solis Invicti* (the birthday of Sol, the Invincible). It was a day of general rejoicing on which the whole city was brilliantly illuminated and the citizens took part in public games. All business was suspended and the people exchanged gifts. Even the custom of the present day, in which small bands go from door to door playing and singing Christian carols, was then practiced, for Ovid says:

> When to the mighty Mother pipes the swain,
> Grudge not a trifle for his pious strain.

The evergreens and mistletoe which are associated with Christmas tide are also of pagan origin. Tertullian rebuked the Christians for decking their doors with garlands on festival days, "according to the custom of the heathen." He knew quite well that all evergreens were sacred to *Dionysus* and therefore not appropriate Christian symbols.

The year, the month and the day of Jesus' birth are unknown, as all Christian scholars agree. Irenaeus claims that Jesus was born fifteen years before the Christian era. Jerome says that he was born three years before the year 1, and Eusebius declares that his birth antedated the Christian era by only one year. But Mosheim, the eminent Christian historian, says that "the year in which it happened has not hitherto been fixed with certainty, notwithstanding the deep and laborious researches of the learned." The Reverend Dr. Giles, in his *Hebrew and Christian Records,* adds:

> Not only do we date our time from the exact year in which Christ is said to have been born, but our ecclesiastical calendar has determined with scrupulous minuteness the day and almost the hour at which every particular of Christ's wonderful life is stated to have happened. All this is implicitly believed by millions, yet all these things are among the most uncertain and shadowy that history has recorded. We have no clue to either the day or the time of year, or even the year itself, in which Christ was born.

The 25th of December was not accepted as the birthday of Jesus for many centuries. Sometimes his birthday was celebrated on the 20th of May, sometimes on the 19th of April, often on the 5th of January. It was only in the fourth century that Pope Pius I., urged by Cyril of Jerusalem, ordered the Bishops to make an investigation and come to some conclusion as to the presumable date of Jesus' birth. Their choice fell upon the 25th of December. Why? Because that date marked the birthday of the pagan gods and also the celebration of the *Brunalia,* or winter solstice. Writing in A.D. 390, St. Chrysostom says: "On this day also the birth of Christ was lately fixed at Rome, in order that, whilst the heathen were busy with their profane ceremonies, the Christians might perform their holy rites undisturbed." Christmas Day, therefore, should not be considered as the birthday of any particular being called Jesus, but as a solar festival commemorating the birth of the Sun.

The writers of the Gospels, whoever they may be have been, disagree as to the place where Jesus was born. Matthew calls the place a *house*. Luke speaks of the infant as having been laid in a *manger,* which implies that he was born in a stable. But Eusebius, the great ecclesiastical historian of the fourth century, states that Jesus was born neither in a house nor a stable, but in a *cave,* and that the Emperor Constantine erected a Temple on the spot, so that Christians could worship in the very place where their Savior was born. The cave selected was one in which had once been celebrated the rites of Adonis.

Why was a cave chosen as the birthplace of Jesus? For the same reason that Jesus was given a Virgin Mother and the 25th of December chosen as his birthday. *It was because all the sun-gods of antiquity first saw the light of day in a cave.* The legend is always the same, whether it refers to Bacchus, Romulus, Adonis, Apollo, Mithras, Hermes or Attys. As these legends were gradually incorporated into "the life" of Jesus, it became necessary to show that he, like all the pagan gods, was also born in a cave.

The next pagan story to be added to the life of Jesus was that of the Star of Bethlehem which was seen by the three Wise Men as they journeyed to Jerusalem. This legend also appears in the lives of all other great Teachers.

The sacred books of the Buddhists relate that the birth of the Buddha was announced to the world by an *asterism* which was seen rising in the heavens. It was called the Messianic Star. The *Fo-pen-hing* says: "The time of Boddhisattva's incarnation is when the constellation Kwei is in conjunction with the Sun." Wise Men, known as the Holy Rishis, were informed by these celestial signs that the Messiah known as the Buddha was born.

In the *Ramayana* the horoscope of Rama's birth appears. It was also accompanied by a Messianic star. When Krishna was born, the Messianic star announcing his birth was pointed out by Nared, the astrologer. Every Indian *avatar* announced his birth by celestial signs. In China a particularly bright star appeared at the birth of Lao-Tze. Brilliant stars announced the births of Moses and Abraham. So also with even the birth of the Caesars, as Canon Farrar has pointed out: "The Greeks and Romans always considered that the births of great men were symbolized by the appearance of heavenly bodies, and the same belief has continued down to comparatively modern times."

The Song of the Heavenly Host, which accompanied the birth of Jesus, also appears in the legends of other Saviors. When Krishna was born, according to the *Vishnu Purana*, "The spirits of heaven danced and sang . . . the clouds emitted low pleasing sounds, and poured down rain of flowers."

At the birth of Apollonius of Tyana a flock of swans clustered round his mother, singing and clapping their wings. At the birth of Confucius five Sages are said to have entered the house, while sounds of music floated through the air. Similar demonstrations are said to have taken place at the birth of the Buddha.

'Mongst the strangers came
A grey haired Saint, Asita, one whose ears,
Long closed to earthly things, caught heavenly sounds,
And heard at prayer beneath his peepul tree
The Devas singing songs at Buddha's birth.

Arnold: *The Light of Asia*

In the Caves of Ajunta pictures of the aged Saint Asita with the infant Buddha may still be seen, as well as portraits of the Wise Men who presented the Buddha with gifts of sandal-wood and incense.

The story of the slaughter of the innocents, in which Herod is supposed to have tried to destroy the infant Jesus, is also universal. The list of sun-gods who were pursued by wicked tyrants is exhaustless. There was Horus, pursued by Typhon; Zoroaster, pursued by an enemy king; Perseus, by the King of Argos; Bacchus, by the King of Thebes, and others without number.

The original of all these tales is in all probability one found in the *Shrimad-Bhagavat*. There it is related that a heavenly voice whispered to the foster father of Krishna, telling him to flee with the child across the river Jumna to avoid the murderous intent of Krishna's uncle Kansa, the reigning King. Kansa, fearing a prophecy that Krishna would be his slayer, sought the life of the infant Savior and sent out messengers to *kill all the infants in the neighboring places*. It is interesting to compare this passage with Matthew, ii. 13. The words are almost identical.

The persecution of Herod and the "slaughter of the innocents" during his reign are entirely without historical foundation. Tacitus, the mortal enemy of all despots, does not mention Herod in this capacity. Neither does Josephus, although he gives a minute account of lesser crimes committed by Herod. Neither is there any record of this atrocity in the Catacombs, nor in early Christian art, before the fifth century. The falsity of the story is witnessed by the fact that such a crime could never have happened at that particular time. A Governor of a Roman province who dared make such an order would have been so speedily overtaken by the vengeance of the Roman people that his head would have fallen from his body before the blood of his victims was dry. As a matter of fact, Herod's son Archalaus was deposed for offences which were trivial in comparison with this alleged slaughter of the innocents by his father.

The Cross is commonly regarded as a purely Christian symbol, but in reality it is one of the oldest symbols in the world. This is now admitted by the majority of Christian scholars. Bishop Colenso says: "Of the several varieties of the cross still in vogue, there is not one amongst them, the existence of which may not be traced to the remotest antiquity."

In ancient India the Cross was used as a symbol of *Agni*, the "God of Fire," its form being that of the *Swastika*. Agni belonged to the earlier Vedic Trinity, of which the other aspects were *Vayu* and *Surya*. This Trinity preceded the later *Trimurti of Brahmâ, Vishnu* and *Siva*.

The Swastika was the talisman of the ancient Jain Kings. It is engraved on every rock-temple and prehistoric building in India and is found in every other country where Buddhists have left their marks.

The Etruscans revered the Cross as a religious symbol. On some of their tombs the Cross is accompanied by a heart. The Cross was also a sacred emblem among the Greeks and Romans. One ancient inscription found in Thessaly is accompanied by a perfect Cross of Calvary, while the tomb of King Midas is decorated with a Greek Cross.

When the Spanish missionaries first set foot in America they were amazed to find the Cross worshipped as devoutly by the Red Indians as by themselves, and called by such "Catholic" names as "the wood of health" or the "emblem of life." In the ruined city of Palenque in Central America many sculptured figures standing beside a cross were discovered in the temples and chapels. Among the ruins of Zaputero were found old crosses which were still reverenced by the Indians. Many crosses were discovered among the Inca remains, and one of them, made of a single piece of polished white marble, was set up in the Roman Catholic Church at Cuzco.

Three forms of the cross were used by the ancient Egyptians: the *crux ansata,* or the cross with a handle; the *Tau,* or the cross without a handle, and the *Tat,* a regular equilateral cross. The Egyptians adored the Cross with the profoundest veneration. The symbol is found on many of their ancient monuments, and may be seen in any of the great Museums which house Egyptian collections. In the Museum of the London University one of the mummies has a perfect Cross of Calvary upon its breast. Many of the Egyptian images hold a cross in their hand. One of these is the image of Horus, who is represented as an infant, cross in hand, sitting upon his mother's knee, and with a cross at the back of the seat they occupy. Many Egyptian sepulchres were planned in the form of a cross, and the Cross was worn by the ladies of ancient Egypt just as it is worn by Roman Catholic women of today.

It appears in China, Tibet and Siam. It is mentioned with the greatest respect in the *Ramayana* and was known in ancient Scandinavia as the Hammer of Thor.

If, then, we find these two—the Cross and the Fire—so closely associated in the symbolism of nearly every nation, it is because of the universal tradition that the whole plan of the universal laws rests upon their combined powers. The Central Point indicates the

intersection of the two great conflicting powers—the centripetal and centrifugal forces—which drive the planets into their elliptical orbits and make them trace a cross in their paths through the Zodiac. These two powers preserve harmony and keep the Universe in steady, unceasing motion, and the four bent arms of the Swastika typify the revolution of the earth upon its axis. So much for the astronomical meaning. The occult meaning has been interpreted by Cornelius Agrippa. Fire is heat—the central point. The perpendicular ray represents the male element, or spirit. The horizontal ray represents the female element—matter. Spirit vivifies and fructifies matter, and both proceed from the central point.

The ancient Babylonians honored the Cross as a religious symbol, and it appears upon their oldest monuments. *Anu,* one of the highest of Babylonian deities, used the Maltese Cross as his symbol of divinity and sovereignty. It was also the symbol of the Babylonian God *Baal,* the "All-devouring Sun."

Sir Robert Ker-Porter in *Travels in Persia and Ancient Babylonia* tells of an ancient bas-relief which he found on the Mountain of the Sepulchres. The ensign held by a standard-bearer is in the shape of a Cross. He also discovered many rock-sepulchres in the same place, all of them in the shape of crosses. These belonged to a period when the Arsacedian Kings ruled Persia. The Cross also appears on many early Phoenician coins, often accompanied by a Lamb and a rosary.

The crux ansata, sometimes called the astrological sign of Venus, was the Egyptian symbol of immortality. When Osiris is represented holding out this cross to a mortal, it signifies that the person to whom he presents it has put off mortality and has entered into the spiritual life. The handle of the crux ansata has a double significance. As an attribute of Isis, it is the mundane circle. As the symbol of law on the breast of a mummy, it signifies the beginningless and endless eternity. On ancient Egyptian papyri Isis is seen standing before the soul, holding a crux ansata in her hand. This form of the Cross is also found in the hands of other Gods, including Baal and *Astarte.* It was also the foremost symbol in the Egyptian Masonry instituted by Count Cagliostro.

The Tau, or the cross with a handle, is an androgyne symbol owing its meaning to the ancient realization of the dualism which pervades all nature. This symbol was also used in both the Bacchic and Eleusinian Mysteries, where it was laid upon the breast of the Initiate after his "new birth" to signify his spiritual regeneration.

The Tau was also held sacred by the Jews. After eating their Paschal meal they marked their doorposts with this sign, drawn with the blood of their sacrificed victim. The "rod of Moses" is now admitted to have been a Tau. When Ezekiel stamped the foreheads of the men who feared the Lord, he made the *Sigma Thau,* as it is translated in the Vulgate. In the painted glass of St. Dionysus an angel appears stamping the same sign on the foreheads of the elect.

The Tat, or the third form of the Egyptian cross, is an equilateral cross placed upon an upright standard. It represents the two principles of creation, and relates to both nature and cosmos. When crowned with the triple crown of Horus it signifies the *septenary* man, the cross standing for the lower quaternary and the triple crown for the three higher principles.

The symbol of the Cross was particularly used in the rites of Initiation. In the *Crata Nepoa,* or the Mysteries of the ancient Egyptian priests, there is a description of an Egyptian initiation. After a preliminary trial at Thebes, where the neophyte had to pass through many trials called the *Twelve Tortures,* he was commanded henceforth to govern his passions and never again to lose the idea of his godhood. Then, as a symbol of the wanderings of the unpurified soul, he had to ascend several ladders and wander about in dark caves, all the doors of which were locked. The first three degrees of his initiation having been passed, the neophyte was commanded "never to desire or seek revenge; to be always ready to help a brother in danger, even at the risk of his own life; to protect those weaker than himself; to ever bear in mind the hour of death and the hour of resurrection in a new and imperishable body."

In the fourth degree the Mystery Name was communicated to him; in the fifth degree he was instructed in alchemy; in the sixth he received instruction in astronomy, and in the seventh was initiated into the Mysteries. After a final probation, the neophyte received a Cross, the Tau, which, at death, was laid upon his breast.

As an esoteric symbol the Tau belonged exclusively, and still belongs, to the Adepts of every country. It was placed as a mark on the brows of Hindu *chelas* and was universally a sign of recognition among Adepts.

In the initiations which took place within the Pyramid of Cheops, the candidate was stretched upon a couch made in the form of a Cross and was plunged into a deep sleep. There he re-

mained for three days and nights. On the morning of the third day he awoke to be initiated by Osiris, the God of Wisdom, afterwards receiving a Tau which was placed upon his breast at death.

A number of these cruciform couches were discovered in the underground halls of different Egyptian Temples after their destruction. Many of the Christian Church Fathers declared that they had been taken there by Christian converts. But Clement of Alexandria and Origen kept silent—they knew better!

Few ideas have contributed so much to the misunderstanding of ancient history as the false belief, long accepted by Christians, that every monument marked with a Cross must necessarily be of Christian origin. As a matter of fact, the early Christians refused to accept the Cross as a Christian symbol. It was not until Christianity became thoroughly "paganized" that it adopted the Cross, and even then it was not the Cross we know today. The famous Cross of Constantine (which was merely a large X with the letter P above it) was simply the ancient insignia of Osiris, as every pagan knew.

The early Christians resented the idea of a Cross being associated with the Christian religion. The great Church Father Minucius Felix, writing to the Romans in the third century, said:

> As for the adoration of the Cross, I must tell you that we (Christians) neither adore crosses nor desire them. You it is, *ye pagans*, who are the most likely people to adore crosses. For what else are your ensigns, flags and standards, but crosses? Your victorious trophies not only represent a cross, *but a cross with a man on it.* (Octavius, xxix.)

Tertullian, writing to the pagans in the same century, indignantly inquires:

> How doth the Athenian Minerva differ from the body of a cross? The origin of your gods is derived from figures moulded on a cross. All those rows of images on your standards are the appendages of crosses; those hangings on your banners are the robes of crosses.

The idea of the crucifixion did not appear in Christian art for many centuries. The Reverend J. P. Lundy asks in *Monumental Christianity*:

> Why should a fact so well known to the heathen as the crucifixion be concealed? And yet its actual realistic representation never occurs in the monuments of Christianity, for more than six or seven centuries.

Early Christian art, as it is seen on sarcophagi, gave but one single incident from the story of the Passion, and that was destitute

of all appearance of suffering. In those days Jesus was always represented as young and beautiful, with no signs of sorrow.

As we have already seen, the earliest figures of Jesus were representations of a Lamb which was often crouched at the foot of a Cross. This custom continued until the year A. D. 680, when it was ordained that the figure of a man fastened to a Cross should be substituted. This was confirmed by Pope Adrian I.

The earliest known association of the human figure with the cross is the crucifix presented by Pope Gregory the Great to Queen Theolinde of Lombardy, now in the Church of St. John at Monza. But no image of the crucified Savior is found in the Catacombs at Rome earlier than that of San Giulio, belonging to the seventh or eighth century.

The original idea of the "Man crucified in Space" certainly came from the ancient Hindus. In the earlier copies of Moor's *Hindu Pantheon* are found pictures of Krishna showing him suspended upon a cross with the marks of nails in his feet and hands. The monk Georgius, in his *Tibetium Alphabetum,* has given pictures of a crucified god who was once worshipped in Nepal. These crucifixes appeared at the crossings of roads, and are said to be figures of Indra. In Tanjore in Southern India, and in Northern India at Oude, relics of the crucified god *Bal-li* have been found. He also is represented with nail holes in both feet and hands.

Thus we see that the Cross, so long accepted as a purely Christian symbol, in reality belongs to the remotest antiquity. We also see that the Cross, now degenerated into a symbol of vicarious atonement and negating any true conception of justice, is actually a symbol possessed of the highest metaphysical meaning.

The philosophical Cross, which the geometrizing Deity divides at the intersecting point, is the basis of the Occultist. Within its symbolism lies the master key which will open the door of every science, physical as well as spiritual. It symbolizes our human existence, for the circle of life circumscribes the four points of the cross, which represent in succession birth, life, death and Immortality.

Later the philosophical cross expanded into the beautiful idea adopted by and represented in the Mysteries—the idea of regenerated man, the mortal, who by crucifying the man of flesh with its passions became born as an Immortal. Still later, owing to the gradual loss of spirituality, the Cross degenerated into a phallic symbol. The sign of the Cross adopted by the Latin Church was phallic from the beginning. But the Greek Cross was that of the Neophyte—the *Chrestos.*

THE HYPNOTIC MENACE

As most students of Theosophy know, the centennial cycle of the Theosophical Movement is largely *forced* into being by the dire necessity for right direction of the instinctive interest in psychic powers, faculties and phenomena, which rises during the first half of each century and culminates in its later years. It was no coincidence that the Salem witchcraft persecutions reached their peak in the '90's of the Seventeenth century. The same dark tendency in the following century was dealt with in Europe by Mesmer, Saint Germain, and Cagliostro, upon whom an enlightened posterity bestowed the reward of comprehensive reputations as charlatans; and in the New World the Rosicrucian and Masonic brethren, assisted by the War of the Revolution, performed similar service. As to last century, the tale is well enough known to Theosophists. . . . .

The psychic cycle of our era is showing its premonitory symptoms in ways more disquieting, if possible, than the spiritualistic movement wihch had its beginning in Rochester during the last century. There is at present a general increase of public interest in the "occult." Astonishingly prominent men in business and politics consult soothsayers as assiduously as any Hindu villager. Astrology—a business at present much mixed between actual knowledge of what was once a comprehensive science, and speculations and corruptions nothing short of superstitious—is not only more prominent in print, but more widely followed than ever before in the Western world. No less than ten American institutions of learning are conducting serious investigations into the psychic world, especially along the lines of telepathy. The natural unfolding of psychic senses and propensities in the race is such that one investigator, Dr. J. B. Rhine, has been able to make a collection of "subjects" who score practically one hundred per cent in difficult telepathic tests. The same psychic powers are unconsciously emerging on every hand in the hysterical suggestibility of the race and in the clairvoyant powers increasingly manifested in parallel plots in literature and identical inventions in science.

Hypnotism has, of course, for some time been as "respectable" in science as its "discoverer," Mesmer, is "disreputable."

That "ingratitude is a crime in occultism" is indeed shadowed forth by the evil effect of such scientific knowledge, accepted and put to use while its discoverers and promulgators are vilified, slandered,

and labelled as "impostors" with almost a machine-like regularity. Great is the debt owed the "alchemists" by modern chemistry; great is the debt to Paracelsus by modern medicine; great, that to Mesmer by modern psychology; but what has been the reward of all these? And in consequence, how dire the misapplications of those sciences by the arrogant moderns!

Yet, if experience be bitter enough, modern science *can* learn some of those lessons which lead to the real science of the Mysteries, so long *in abscondito.*

Some little time ago students of a certain university took part in a startling series of hypnotic demonstrations; and, according to a writer in the San Francisco *Chronicle,* "Ever since . . . physicians, especially psychiatrists, have been trying to stem the tide of a rising interest in the hypnotic art."

> The rules are so simple and opportunities for practicing "the black art" so frequent, that doctors have been outspoken in condemnation, fearing a parlor game might become an actual menace.
>
> It is consciousness of power they fear; the unbridled curiosity of men and women who have been exposed to hypnotism in half a dozen other forms, turned loose upon themselves and their friends as a new thrill.

According to this report, a prominent New York physician granted an interview on the subject on condition that his name be kept secret. We quote some of his statements:

> Hypnotism is suggestion. It may be personal or in mass. The theater is the most common place for mass hypnotism: there you have all the necessary conditions. . . .
>
> Now this sort of hypnotism is rarely dangerous. Mass suggestion—which is what makes us accept decrees of fashion, too—is not likely to be harmful. But when one person hypnotizes another, breaking down the critical consciousness and keeping only the subconscious awake, he is playing with fire. It is a dangerous practice, not as drugs or weapons are dangerous, but more subtly.
>
> In hypnosis, you impose upon an already suggestible person a new experience which shows he or she is suggestible. Each ego tries to maintain its own integrity. This is part of life. It fights the imposition of another's power upon it. Knowing that it has lost the fight is bad for the ego. No subject will do anything in a trance he would not do of his own nature—but doing it at someone's dictation has a wrecking effect.

Theosophists cannot agree that mass suggestion is rarely harmful; on the contrary, it is even more menacing to social welfare than individual malpractice. The country at this moment is close to mental stupefaction largely caused by such influences.

With regard to the subjection of the individual to the will of the operator, the article quoted illustrates the dangerous "wishful thinking" caused by scientific ignorance: "It is nonsense, our modern medicos say, to suppose anyone could be forced to do anything against his essential nature, although superficially the subject has no will power."

Technically, this may be true—depending upon just what one means by "essential nature," which, as Theosophists know, is a far more recondite matter than any ordinary doctor can realize. We may grant that a man cannot be hypnotized into committing a crime or unseemly act that is not in his "Karma" (potentially within his inner nature as Skandhic propensity) but the fact remains that under hypnotic influence men and women are guilty of crimes or unethical acts which in all probability they would never have committed in the ordinary course of events. Setting aside the damage to others, the weakness in such persons might have been discovered by themselves and eliminated in harmless ways. There are natural channels for such adjustments to take place, *e.g.*, the moral discipline provided by Theosophy.

Hypnotism is fast gaining ground in medicine and psychiatry in widely varying applications. It seems strange indeed that physicians do not make use of the converse of the "essential nature" theory and realize that such means cannot reach the real, inner illness. But the practice is infinitely worse in its popular and still more ignorant phases, which are sure to become increasingly harmful as the centennial cycle of psychism gathers momentum. Men who allow themselves to be hypnotized under any pretext are courting moral suicide; layman who pry into and tamper with the susceptible and delicate mechanism of the psychic nature of others are generating incalculable Karmic debts to nature; and woe to the hypnotic doctors whose motives are not perfectly pure! Lacking Theosophy, how can the latter suspect the frequent if not invariable transmission of their own personal tendencies and defects to the subjects of such operations?

In view of the rapidly growing interest in and practice of Hypnotism, there is no more opportune time than now to reprint one of the first and most complete discussions of this subject in Theosophical literature.

HYPNOTISM*

WHAT is the hypnotic force or influence? What really happens when a hypnotic experiment is performed? What is proved by it? What force is exerted that, after making a man sleep, rouses him to a false wakefulness in which he obeys a suggestion, seems to lose his identity, becomes apparently another person, speaks a language he knows nothing of, sees imagined pictures as real ones? How is it that in this state his physical body follows the operator's suggestion and becomes blistered by a piece of paper which possesses no blistering power, sneezes when there is no actual titillation of the olfactory nerves, shivers over a hot stove, and perspires if it be suggested that a block of ice is a mass of fire?

All this and very much more has been done in hypnotic experiments, just as it was done many years ago by mesmerizers, electro-biologists, and wandering fascinators of all sorts. Then it was outside the pale of science, but now since physicians renamed a part of it "hypnotism" it is settled to stay among the branches of psychology theoretical and applied. The new schools, of course, went further than the first did or could. They added a species of witchcraft to it by their latest claim to be able to externalize and localize the nerve-sensitiveness and hence mental impressionability of the subject; to put it in his photograph or within a glass of water, so that if the former be scratched or the latter touched, the patient at once jumped or screamed. This is the old way of making a wax image of your form and sticking pins in it, whereupon you pined and died; men and women were burned for this once. This, while interesting and important if true, possesses the interest of a nightmare, as it suggests how in the near future one's picture may be for sale to be blistered and stabbed by an enemy, provided the extraneous localization of sensibility is first provided for. But the other experiments touch upon the great questions of identity, of consciousness, of soul, and of personality. They raise an issue as to whether the world be physical and mechanical, as Descartes thought, or whether it is fleeting and a form of consciousness existing because of thought and dominated by thought altogether, as the Theosophists modern and ancient always held.

Professor James of Harvard has published his conclusion that experiments in hypnotism convince him, as they have convinced many, of the existence of the hidden self in man, while the French schools dispute whether it is all due to one personality mimicking many, or many personalities wrapped up in one person and showing one phase

---

* This article was originally written for the New York *World*, at request, and was printed by Wm. Q. Judge in *The Path* for February, 1894.

after another. Facts are recorded and wonderful things done, but no reasonable and final explanation has been made by the modern schools. Except here and there they, being ignorant of man's hidden real nature and powers, or denying the existence of such, see no cause for alarm in all these experiments and no danger to either society or the individual. As the true evolution of man's inner powers at the same rate and time concurrently with all other racial and planetary evolution is not admitted by these schools, they cannot perceive in the future any possibly devilish use of hypnotic powers. The Theosophist, however, suggests an explanation for the phenomena, points to similar occurrences through history, and intimates a danger to come if the thinking world does not realize our true nature as a being made of thought and consciousness, built in and on these, and destructible by them also so far as his personality is concerned. The danger is not in knowing these things and processes, but in the lack of morality and ethics in the use of them both now and in the future.

One theory for use in explaining and prosecuting hypnotic research is about as follows. Man is a soul who lives on thoughts and perceives only thoughts. Every object or subject comes to him as a thought, no matter what the channel or instrument, whether organ of sense or mental center, by which it comes before him. These thoughts may be words, ideas, or pictures. The soul-man has to have an intermediary or connecting link with Nature through and by which he may cognize and experience. This link is an ethereal double or counterpart of his physical body, dwelling in the latter; and the physical body is Nature so far as the soul-man is concerned. In this ethereal double (called astral body) are the sense-organs and centers of perception, the physical outer organs being only the external channels or means for concentrating the physical vibrations so as to transmit them to the astral organs and centers where the soul perceives them as ideas or thoughts. This inner ethereal man is made of the ether which science is now admitting as a necessary part of Nature, but while it is etheric it is none the less substantial.

Speaking physically, all outer stimulus from nature is sent from without to within. But in the same way stimuli may be sent from the within to the without, and in the latter mode is it that our thoughts and desires propel us to act. Stimuli are sent from the astral man within to the periphery, the physical body, and may dominate the body so as to alter it or bring on a lesion partial or total. Cases of the hair turning grey in a night are thus possible. And in this way a suggestion of a blister may make a physical swelling, secretion, inflam-

mation, and sore on a subject who has submitted himself to the influence of the hypnotizer. The picture or idea of a blister is impressed on the astral body, and that controls all the physical nerves, sensations, currents, and secretions. It is done through the sympathetic nervous plexus and ganglia. It was thus that ecstatic fanatical women and men by brooding on the pictured idea of the wounds of Jesus produced on their own bodies, by internal impression and stimulus projected to the surface, all the marks of crown of thorns and wounded side. It was self-hypnotization, possible only in fanatical hysterical ecstasy. The constant brooding imprinted the picture deeply on the astral body; then the physical molecules, ever changing, became impressed from within and the *stigmata* were the result. In hypnotizing done by another the only difference is one of time, as in the latter instances the operator has simply to make the image and impress it on the subject after the hypnotic process has been submitted to, whereas in self-hypnotization a long-continued ecstasy is necessary to make the impression complete.

When the hypnotic process—or subjugation, as I call it—is submitted to, a disjunction is made between the soul-man and the astral body, which then is for the time deprived of will, and is the sport of any suggestion coming in unopposed, and those may and do sometimes arise outside of the mind and intention of the operator. From this arises the sensitiveness to suggestion. The idea, or thought, or picture of an act is impressed by suggesting it on the astral body, and then the patient is waked. At the appointed time given by the suggestor a secondary sleep or hypnotic state arises automatically, and then, the disjunction between soul and astral body coming about of itself, the suggested act is performed unless—as happens rarely—the soul-man resists sufficiently to prevent it. Hence we point to an element of danger in the fact that at the suggested moment the hypnotic state comes on secondarily by association. I do not know that hypnotizers have perceived this. It indicates that although the subject be dehypnotized the influence of the operator once thrown on the subject will remain until the day of the operator's death.

But how is it that the subject can see on a blank card the picture of an object which you have merely willed to be on it? This is because every thought of any one makes a picture; and a thought of a definite image makes a definite form in the astral light in which the astral body exists and functions, interpenetrating also every part of the physical body. Having thus imaged the picture on the card, it remains in the astral light or sphere surrounding the card, and is there objective to the astral sense of the hypnotized subject.

Body, soul, and astral man properly in relation give us a sane man; hypnotized, the relation is broken and we have a person who is not for the time wholly sane. Acute maniacs are those in whom the disjunction between astral man and soul is complete. Where the hypnotized one remains for months in that state, the astral man has become the slave of the body and its recollections, but as the soul is not concerned no real memory is present and no recollection of the period is retained.

The varied personalities assumed by some subjects brings up the doctrine of a former life on earth for all men. The division between soul and astral man releases the latter from some of the limitations of brain memory so that the inner memory may act, and we then have a case of a person reënacting some part of his former life or lives. But a second possibility also exists—that by this process another and different entity may enter the body and brain and masquerade as the real person. Such entities do exist and are the astral shells of men and women out of the body. If they enter, the person becomes insane; and many a maniac is simply a body inhabited by an entity that does not belong to it.

The process of hypnotizing is as yet unknown in respect to what does happen to the molecules. We claim that those molecules are pressed from periphery to center instead of being expanded from the inside to the surface. This contraction is one of the symptoms of death, and therefore hypnotizing is a long step toward physical and moral death. The view expressed by Dr. Charcot that a subject is liable to fall under the influence at the hands of anyone should be admitted, as also that in the wake of the hypnotizer will be found a host of hysteriacs, and that it all should be regulated by laws is unquestionable. I go still further and say that many persons are already in a half-hypnotized state, easily influenced by the unprincipled or the immoral; that the power to hypnotize and to be sensitive to it are both progressive states of our racial evolution; that it can and will be used for selfish, wicked, and degrading purposes unless the race, and especially the occidental portion of it, understand and practices true ethics based on the brotherhood of man. Ethics of the purest are found in the words of Jesus, but are universally negatived by Church, State, and individual. The Theosophical doctrines of man and nature give a true and necessary basis and enforcement to ethics, devoid of favoritism or illogical schemes of eternal damnation. And only through those doctrines can the dangers of hypnotism be averted, since legislation, while affixing penalties, will not alter or curtail private acts of selfishness and greed. WILLIAM Q. JUDGE, F.T.S.

BOUNDLESS BLISS

IN the sixth chapter of the *Bhagavad-Gita* we find reference to "that boundless bliss which is not connected with objects of the senses." Is it difficult to understand bliss, or even happiness, *not* connected with objects of the senses? For most of us it is. We constantly seek happiness and occasionally experience moments of sensuous bliss, but these are transitory and limited. We delight in the sound of music, a baby's laugh; we are pleased by the form and color of a painting or the proportions of a building. It may be a sunset or a tree shrouded in fog which delights the sense; a flash of lightning or a crash of thunder which thrills and awes. The march of constellations across the night sky or the millions of stars swinging through space enrich the feeling nature, but do they give "that boundless bliss"?

For many, the possession of home and comfort spells happiness, for others, family and friends. Are not all these "objects of senses"? Is our happiness in the possession of them unalloyed? Or do we attain them filled with fear that they may be lost? The home may be destroyed by fire or other calamity, friends and family claimed by death. For countless incarnations we have followed the path of attachment—of illusion and delusion of the senses. What shall we do about it?

Krishna says: "For this my divine illusive power, acting through the natural qualities, is difficult to surmount, and those only can surmount it who have *recourse to me alone.*"

Recourse: "retracing one's course"; "returning to the starting point"; "a source of aid"—are a few of the definitions of this word.

We started on this long journey of evolution as high spiritual beings, but having become enamored of objects of the senses we now find it difficult to "surmount" this "divine illusive power." We must retrace our *course.* We must return to the starting point by trying to live as spiritual beings once again. This really begun, we will find Krishna an unfailing source of aid.

"These two, light and darkness, are the world's eternal ways." "No devotee who knoweth these two paths is ever deluded." What are the "two paths"? Seeking for bliss in objects of the senses is the path of darkness. To have recourse to Krishna, the Self of All, is alone the Path of Light, which leads to that boundless bliss not connected with objects of the senses.

YOUTH-COMPANIONS' FORUM

IF the teaching of Theosophy is definitely against such practices as vivisection, vaccination, and the use of animal serums in any form, why do not Theosophists as a body take aggressive action to put a stop to them? Would not results of greater practical value be gained in this way than by writing and speaking about these evils?

(*a*) The work which Theosophy seeks to accomplish is to draw the developing intelligence of mankind to a consideration of the Truths concerning the soul, its nature and destiny. Theosophists are normal men and women who, perceiving the truth of Theosophy, seek to apply its principles in their lives. The sole bond which unites them is their similarity of aim, purpose and teaching. As theosophists, "they can only act together in matters which are common to all—that is, in Theosophy itself. As individuals, each is left perfectly free to follow out his or her particular line of political thought and action, so long as this does not conflict with Theosophical principles." (*Key to Theosophy*, 232.)

While the teaching of Theosophy is definitely against such practices as vivisection, vaccination, and the use of animal serums in any form, the concerted action of theosophists to put a stop to them would constitute a side issue and prove a diffusion of forces which, to be effective, must be concentrated. Theosophists are advisedly engaged in the dissemination and promulgation of the teachings of Theosophy, pure and simple. The evils of vivisection, vaccination and serums are only particular "illustrations" of the general ignorance and blindness which afflict the race. There are also political, social, religious and endless other evils which need correction. Were Theosophists to crusade against each one of these nothing permanent would result and Theosophy itself would soon be forgotten.

The lesson we may learn from history is that all efforts which have for their end the reform of specific vicious practices have been temporary in effect. Attempts to eliminate evils by aggressive action must, by their very nature, remain partial and incomplete. To be permanent, a reform must have the support of the people, based upon the clear perception and knowledge of those concerned. When knowledge displaces ignorance and speculation in human affairs, the evils will disappear of themselves. H.P.B. made clear statement of this principle:

> The faint-hearted have asked in all ages for signs and wonders, and when these fail to be granted, they refuse to believe.

> Such are not those who will ever comprehend Theosophy pure and simple. But there are others among us who realize intuitionally that the recognition of pure Theosophy—the philosophy of the rational explanation of things and not the tenets—is of the most vital importance in the Society, inasmuch as it alone can furnish the beacon-light needed to guide humanity on its true path. (*The First Message to the American Theosophists,* 1888.)

(*b*) This question is most vital, for it contains by implication the idea so prevalent in the world, that Theosophy is fundamentally "impractical." If Theosophy is truly for the welfare of humanity, if it is against all injustice, corruption, and oppression of whatever kind, why, then, does it not show the courage of its convictions and fight these forces for evil and their representatives? The communist or fascist, believing his principles to be right, works aggressively for his cause by means of vigorous proselytizing propaganda and believes in using force, when necessary. While we may deplore their methods, we cannot doubt the integrity and consistency of conviction of many followers of these movements. Similarly, the anti-vivisectionists take every means and opportunity to denounce and bring about the abolition of vivisection. What do theosophists do in a "practical way" to aid the cause they profess sympathy for, other than by dint of spoken and written words which reach so few of the great mass of men? These are the arguments and queries propounded by those who see Theosophy as nothing more than an intellectual pursuit.

Two basic errors in the popular ideas of "reform" have brought immeasurable misery, strife and bitterness to mankind. The first mistake is in the condemnation of the *person* for his beliefs. The other is the endeavor to *force* beliefs upon those who hold different convictions. The church condemns the poor heathen and all other nonbelievers to perdition—for their beliefs. The medical profession, tacitly assuming that its ever-changing hypotheses provide adequate knowledge of the effects of its practices, dogmatically enforces its theory of vaccination wherever possible. Conscientious objectors to vaccination, supporting their contentions with scientific evidence and reason, are insulted or ignored.

The fascists and communists become the mortal enemies of any who dare to deny the validity of their doctrines. Condemning rather than endeavoring to understand, forcing instead of teaching, the different religions and peoples of the world are in a continuous state of social, moral, political and economic war. So also with the individual. Having given ourselves up to some particular line of thought or self-interest, we are too often prone to sway others to our beliefs, not by

an objective, impersonal presentation of what we have to offer, but rather through pressure or personal persuasion—the *argumentum ad hominem,* a lawyer would say.

Truth requires no condemnation, no force, no passionate eloquence. It stands alone, its own compelling force! If there be some too blind to see, little more can be done. Fancy "teaching" a child that "two and two is four" by promising him sweets if he agrees with you; or by threat of punishment if he fails to recognize the fact. It is not difficult to find examples on a larger scale, where precisely such methods, differing only in degree, are employed.

If "Ideas Rule the World," then the corollary is that by changing its ideas we may change the world. This is the method used by theosophists to promulgate their philosophy. No appeal is made to anything save the power of understanding in every man. What other appeal can correct erroneous *ideas*?

Should we attempt to curb the practices of vivisection and inoculation by aggressive action, we would become guilty of the same mistakes made by the sponsors of these practices. "Aggressive action" implies the use of force or condemnation. We would be suppressing effects instead of eliminating causes. The cause is ignorance, the cure is knowledge.

Does Theosophy have anything to say about "operations"? Doctors go on the theory that a badly infected organ should be cut away to protect the rest of the body. Is there any reason why we should not be operated on for appendicitis, swollen tonsils, etc.?

Disease is the veritable demon of our modern civilization that avariciously clutches at its innocent victims, finding its entrance into the lives of rich and poor alike, and finally taking its toll of painful death in almost every case. Who dies "naturally" nowadays?

Where fear exists, there will be found ignorance, for man fears only that which he does not understand. Fear is the destroyer of self-reliance and will ever cause men to seek a leader who promises immunity from that which is feared. Thus has our medical profession become such a powerful force in modern life.

Is disease an enemy of civilization?

The Ocean of Theosophy teaches that our bodies are composed of numerous infinitesimal lives, ranging all the way from microbes and bacteria to the minutest conceivable organism beyond the range of investigation. "They are divided," says Mr. Judge, "into two classes, one the destroyers, the other the preservers, and these two war upon each other from birth until the destroyers win." Does not

the presence of disease in the body simply point to the fact that a more fierce and concentrated fight is being waged between these two forces, a fight precipitated by the presence of some injurious matter which must be eliminated? If this is true, disease should be a beneficial process, cleansing the system of impurities.

Let us consider the various types of diseases, classified by doctors as acute, sub-acute and chronic. An acute disease is one that is attended with more or less violent symptoms, comes speedily to a crisis and dies out as quickly. All fevers fall under this heading. Here nature's preservative forces assume an offensive attack upon poisons in the body. When they have been eliminated, peace at once ensues. Fever is nature's safety valve, her quickest, most efficient way of cleansing the body of impurities. However, if we interfere with this natural combustion of poisons, complications arise.

The majority of our physicians practice allopathy (*allo*—another, *pathy*—disease). This is a method of treating diseases by inducing through the use of drugs or serum an action opposite to the disease it is sought to cure; in other words, to counteract one disease by causing another of a less harmful nature. The drug, being foreign to the body, produces irritation (nature's effort to expel it). Such methods can only destroy the natural balance between the preservers and destroyers in the body. Part of the preservers have to divert their strength against the new enemy, which necessitates a defensive rather than an offensive attitude. This condition is called sub-acute and is more dangerous and lasts longer than the first. During the epidemics of influenza in 1918-19, in which over a million lives were lost, the mortality rate among the patients of doctors who administered drugs was from 15 per cent to 25 per cent, whereas those who used drugless methods lost but 2 per cent.

The continuous presence of foreign subsances in the system due to emotional causes, wrong diet, drugging, etc., results in the chronic condition—diseases which last a long time or keep recurring. Here the preservative forces no longer have the power to take the initiative in expelling disease, but need their utmost strength to hold their own. The continued failure to expel the drug or other poisons from the body finally exhausts the organ where it is lodged. Even in this case disease is beneficial, for it concentrates the impurities which, were they diffused, would ultimately cause death.

In the first half of man's life cycle the preservative forces are normally on the offensive side. That is why the majority of sicknesses up to that time are acute or febrile in nature. In the latter half of man's life the destroyers begin to dominate. This accounts for the

prevalence of chronic ailments among older people. They have poisons in their system, but not enough energy to start and carry out combustion and burn them up. If they could develop a fever they would be chronically sick no longer.

Where then do operations come in? That is just it, they don't, or rather shouldn't come in. If drugs interfere with the natural healing process, operations do so a hundred-fold more. A diseased organ points to a concentrated fight rather than a diffused one. All diseases have their physical origin in the blood stream. Of what value, then, is removing a diseased organ? If the surgeon understood the real cause and purpose of inflammation or disease, even when pus is being formed, he would be aware that this is nature's method of purification. Once the cause is removed nature herself would soon find a way of draining the pus.

The tonsils are an organ for absorbing poison rather than generating pus as commonly believed. To remove enlarged tonsils will therefore only cause the pus to go back into the general circulation of blood and become absorbed by another organ of lower resistance, for the cause for formation of pus still remains. The case of appendicitis is similar. Even in peritonitis, where the pus filled apendices are ruptured, operations are most dangerous and usually fatal. Nature is better able when left alone to drain the pus in a natural way, as has been proven by some doctors, while the use of drugs and anaesthetics and the shock that always accompanies a surgical operation combine to weaken the patient and lessen his chance of survival.

Does surgery then play any constructive part in the scheme of things? Certainly, but in the emergency field primarily, in cases of internal injuries, broken bones, etc., and perhaps even in the removing of large tumors which interfere with the natural function of vital organs.

Thus far, sickness and its physical causes have been discussed, but this is only a fraction of the story. If we ponder over the following aphorism on Karma, dealing with cataclysms of nature, and apply it to the physical body, we shall have the true causes for disease:

> Karma operates to produce cataclysms of nature by concatenation through the mental and astral planes of being. A cataclysm may be traced to an immediate physical cause such as internal fire and atmospheric disturbance, but these have been brought on by the disturbance created through the dynamic power of human thought.

THE CENTENARY CYCLE

"BEING is an endless cycle within the one absolute eternity, wherein move numberless inner cycles finite and conditioned. "Thus *The Secret Doctrine* (I, 221). The cycle of "Spirit" is a three-phase one, of "Matter" four-fold, of "Incarnation" septenary, or the two combined. These "three lines of evolution"—Spirit, Matter, Incarnation—when added to the seven, give the number 10, the "cycle of perfection" or completion, which makes each Kingdom in nature a world within itself, each action or set of actions a finality—the whole a series of wheels within wheels, forever renewing and repeating itself, whether on a higher or a lower spiral.

Applying this mathematical and numerical order of procession and precession to the Theosophical Movement of our times, the present Movement is asserted to have begun, in the East and in the West, in the fourteenth cenury. Why at that time and not some other? The question is worth pondering.

Again, the assertion is made that each century since the fourteenth a renewal impulse has been imparted—in the West. Has there been no corresponding impulse given in the East? Nothing is said on that subject, so far as we know, but what *is* said is that the Western impulse had its origin in the East. Since the fourteenth century the West has more and more penetrated the East—and it has not been a "peaceful penetration." The East has paid for six centuries a frightful price for its Theosophical penetration of the West. This, too, is worth thinking about.

The nineteenth century furnished the sixth impulsion, the mission of H. P. Blavatsky—a peaceful penetration of both East and West. What will the seventh be like when it begins in 1975? Will there be a true Renaissance—or chaos the world around in which to begin the building or the rebuilding? Will the West suffer the Karma of the East "come home to roost," while the East rises like a noble Phoenix from the ashes of its past? Or will the Movement once more become one?

More Theosophists think about the mission and the message of H.P.B., more the Movement itself will become Incarnate, East and West.

SOMETHING IN COMMON

KNOWING the existence of numberless viewpoints we are apt to overlook the fact that each mind has much in common with all minds. Every man is endowed with the duality of perception distinguished by the terms, Higher and Lower *Manas*. Every man possesses the path or bridge between the two—*Antaskarana,* that *human* area in the field of conscious experience where the sensuous and the supersensuous worlds intersect. This middle principle of thought, will and feeling, then, is the instrument of either traffic or of communion, between egos—the common ground on which men may meet by any one of three possible means of interchange. These are, respectively, on the basis of: mutual desires, as with the salesman who converses with his prospect; the discussion and comparison of more or less mutual *personal* interests; and finally, the common aspirations and longings for truth which rise in the human heart. Thus it is possible for theosophists to deal with all sorts and conditions of men.

The theosophist has nothing to sell, but he has something in common with all men. He is human. He is also divine. And as he uses these common elements in his dealings with other men his opportunities for calling attention to what they have in common increase. In this way Theosophy gains a hearing and an introduction. Probably all of us have had dealings with individuals of such excellent character that we have wished they might accept the teachings of Theosophy and increase their power for good. And, perhaps, acting overzealously, we have closed their ears by speaking too soon or too vehemently. The experience of many students shows that the ability to listen is often of more value than the ability to talk. If we encourage the other to tell us his ideas about Life, Law and Being, then we have opportunity to lead him to distinguish between the true and false, and together to build upon the basis of a common interest in the true. If we do not make a "convert," we at least may gain for truth a strengthened conviction that may in time lead to Theosophy.

Each new visitor to a theosophical meeting carries away with him certain impressions based upon things heard or seen, as does each one who converses with a student. With some, we have so much in common that it is only necessary to reduce our ideas to a common terminology as basis for mutual understanding. With others, we apparently have in common only our humanity and our divinity—still *something*.

To insist that our ideas are right and that Theosophy alone is correct—however truly stated—may be a mistaken method; we cannot "prove" it, although we may induce another to prove it to himself. Sometimes he makes *us* prove it to ourselves to a greater degree than before!

A theosophist who is a musician may appear to have little in common with a materialist who is a chemist, but give the chemist an opportunity to express his ideas in regard to the existence and behavior of an atom, the musician will find many analogies to demonstrate common processes in his own existence and the practice of his profession. Given sufficient opportunities, and meeting with open minds, the way is paved for mutual understanding of *universal* processes. The chemist may no longer recoil from such statements as, "All that a man can know of the Supreme is what he knows in himself, through himself and by himself," while the musician adds to his lore a mass of corroborative detail.

But to refuse to another man the expression of his thoughts, taking it for granted that they are wrong unless he is a theosophist, is to lose the chance of meeting on common ground. Ordinary discrimination enables one to distinguish the "crank" with an "axe to grind" from the thoughtful man whose ideas need only clarification and direction.

That which theosophists have in common with other men may be used as a foundation to build upon. Whether our opportunity to present Theosophy comes through Christians, Jews, Mohammedans or Agnostics, we can make use of the common elements. Sometimes the ground must be cleared for building, but it is rarely necessary to raze existing structures altogether. The pillars of Strength, Devotion, Sympathy and Sacrifice, may remain in place, and much of the other material may be used again in new combinations. The traits and propensities we have developed through long ages can now be made to serve the cause of Theosophy.

We can never build for the other fellow, nor can we plan for him; we can only show him the desirability of building anew. And, so long as our individual viewpoints remain, we can never standardize the *approach* to Truth. Each student will study or work in his own way, but if the motive is right and the Goal is one, the work will go on. The Secret Doctrine teaches "The fundamental *identity* of *all* souls with the Universal Over-Soul." We strive to learn it, and all beings in the universe aid us in the learning, as we aid them, through our *identity*. After all, we do have *much* in common.

ON THE LOOKOUT

Scientific Dualism

The swing of scientific thought away from nineteenth century materialism is evident on every hand. Hardly a scientist of note has not contributed his mystical speculations as to the ultimate nature of things. Most recent are the ideas advanced by Dr. Gustaf Stromberg, Mt. Wilson astro-physicist, who offers a rational basis for individual immortality. The universe, he says, is dual, having a "particle aspect" and a "wave aspect." (Los Angeles *Herald and Express,* March 6.) From this basic conception, Dr. Stromberg proceeds to erect his metaphysical structure:

> It is very significant that we cannot observe radio waves as such. It is their effect on electric particles which changes them from an unobservable potentiality into an observable actuality. The radio waves are links which connect the moving electrons in the transmitter with those in the receiving sets.
>
> The motions of bodies in general are governed by pilot-waves. It is their subtle hands which govern the motions of stars and planets, and of the objects on the earth.
>
> Since our sense organs can only be activated when certain forms of energy are imparted to them, it is natural that we have given special emphasis and reality to those elements in the universe which carry energy in observable form. We are inclined to regard the earth as more "real" than its gravitational field.
>
> If we admit the existence of an actual distinction between the material and the immaterial world, we can to some extent understand certain phenomena in living organisms, phenomena which otherwise appear to be entirely inexplicable. . . .
>
> We are built of matter, but there is also something which gives us not only the structure of living organisms, but also consciousness and memory. The latter belongs to the immaterial, rather than the material universe.

An Immaterial Intelligence

> There are several reasons for believing that certain fundamental immaterial elements in plants and animals can exist without being associated with matter. Some of these elements are extremely stable and appear to retain their properties after the death of the individual.
>
> On such a basis we can obtain a physical picture of the entities which in plants and animals carry inherited characters.

> Some of the entities are so stable that the corresponding characters appear to have remained practically unchanged during millions of years of organic development.
>
> It may also be possible to assign a space-time aspect to mental phenomena in general. In that case we should be able to picture a physical structure of memory and assign reasons for its permanence, in spite of the continuous renewal of the atoms in the living brain structure.
>
> We may also obtain a reasonable scientific basis for the immortality of the soul and the indestructibility of the individual memory.

Dr. Stromberg's admission of the need for "an actual distinction between the material and immaterial world" in order to explain "certain phenomena in living organisms," is, in the words of H. P. Blavatsky, "The whole issue of the quarrel between the profane and the esoteric sciences." It now resolves to one of nomenclature. She calls it "the belief in, and demonstration of, the existence of an astral body within the physical, the former independent of the latter."

A Tardy Recognition

It has taken over fifty years for this idea to become respectably current among scientific thinkers. A generation ago a pronouncement such as that quoted from the noted astronomer would have brought forth hoots and jeers from sceptic colleagues. Today, he is but following the "fashion." That his diction is from the vocabulary of science in no way affects the parallelism of ideas with Theosophical teaching. Recognition of an "invisible world" having occupied half a century, will there be a similar interval before it is realized that this world is itself subject to many subdivisions? It is evident that Dr. Stromberg has no perception of the fact that he is discussing phenomena which have to do with three distinct planes—the astral, the psychic, and the spiritual. So long as such confusion is restricted to the intellect, no great danger exists. But let the reality of these states be encountered through the perception of the emotional nature and there will be quite other consequences. The medium who persists in the delusion that astral entities are "spiritual influences" treads the path of moral destruction. The fantasies of the religiously intoxicated psychic can lead only to another reign of superstitious darkness. Both of these are led on by the intuitive feeling that the *divine* does exist; the fault lies in their ignorance of the intermediate planes which separate matter and spirit, from the demoniac to the finer gradations of psychic perception.

IN SEARCH OF "THE MISSING LINK"

Dr. John C. Merriam, president of the Carnegie Institution of Washington, has announced a "man-hunt" to find "Pliocene" man, which will start in Java. (Los Angeles *Examiner,* March 21.) According to the report, "The hunt is hoped to settle the controversy whether man originated from or with the apes, or separately." It is pleasant to learn that this is still an open question among anthropologists. One supposes that the texts used in the schools, almost all of which imply that mankind undoubtedly evolved from some kind of anthropoid, were written from that larger point of view which desires to simplify life by giving the common people a few clear dogmas to believe, leaving experts to settle whether they are true or not. Such interpretation of scientific education bears a curious resemblance to Roman Catholic psychology. The same report announces the discovery of a "small ape with near-human teeth" which Prof. Robert Broom, of Pretoria, South Africa, calls a "true human relative," possibly a "degenerated descendant of the same stock which gave rise to man." Apparently, he sees in this belief no conflict with his theory that a "spiritual force" was involved in the development of the human being.

> I believe [he says] that all evolution came about under the guidance of nonmaterial forces, so as to result in man, and that man is the end of evolution. . . . I mean spiritual forces. I mean some intelligence outside. I think there probably were many of these spiritual forces, rather than just one. Their combined result was the appearance and development of man.

THE THEOSOPHIC DOCTRINE

The forces which in combination produce the sevenfold planetary evolution are described in pages 213-22 of volume I of *The Secret Doctrine.* They are seven—"subdivided into numberless groups of divine Spiritual, semi-Spiritual, and ethereal Beings." The two fundamental errors made by Prof. Broom are in his explicit assumption that the intelligence which brings about the development of form is *external,* and the implicit idea that there was no human intelligence until the present man-form appeared. The part played in evolution by self-conscious beings is given by H.P.B., as follows (*S.D.* I, 282):

> Neither the form of man, nor that of any animal, plant or stone has ever been *created,* and it is only on this plane of ours that it commenced "becoming," *i.e.,* objectivising into its present materiality, or expanding *from within outwards,* from the

most sublimated and supersensuous essence into its grossest appearance. Therefore *our* human forms have existed in the Eternity as astral or ethereal prototypes; according to which models, the Spiritual Beings (or Gods) whose duty it was to bring them into objective being and terrestrial Life, evolved the protoplasmic forms of the future *Egos* from *their own essence*. After which, when this human *Upadhi,* or basic mould was ready, the natural terrestrial Forces began to work on those supersensuous moulds *which contained, besides their own,* the elements of all the past vegetable and future animal forms of this globe in them. Therefore, man's *outward* shell passed through every vegetable and animal body before it assumed the human shape.

A Scientist "Changes His Mind"

On the same occasion that Prof. Broom introduced his theory (an international symposium on early man sponsored by the Philadelphia Academy of Natural Science), Dr. Eugene DuBois, discoverer of the famous "Java Man," announced that he no longer regards the creature as a man. The remains of the "pithecanthropus erectus," the scholarly title of the Java Man, were found by Dr. DuBois in 1891—forty-six years ago. At the present date museums all over the world harbor reconstructed busts of the monster, and generations of school children have walked curiously by, pausing to read the placard which describes it is the forerunner of our present humanity. Now Dr. DuBois thinks he made a mistake. He expresses "his present belief that the creature was not man, but a giant gibbon with characteristics tending toward, but not relating it to the human." But what will Dr. DuBois and his fellow anthropologists think tomorrow? — and the day after?

A Publisher on Reincarnation

Speaking before the Kiwanis Club of Los Angeles on March 17, Manchester Boddy, publisher of the Los Angeles *Daily News,* compared the difficulties of society as a whole with those of the individual:

> Social problems, like their solutions, develop over a period of many consecutive lives, whereas the problems of the individual begin with his birth and end with his death—a matter of comparatively few years indeed. During the late depression and continuing today, millions of individuals were clamoring, and clamor, for Government activity that will produce jobs. Now

it is possible that the establishment of WPA, SERA, PWA, etc., tended to solve the social problem. But the individual finds new problems attending government employment as difficult as the problems he encountered in private employment. What we call social progress is simply an endless succession of problems and their solutions, each solution engendering a new problem—and each problem developing its own solution.

Now the case of the individual is entirely different. He, too, has an endless succession of problems, but unless we take refuge in the metaphysical world and fortify our position with belief in the philosophy of reincarnation, the individual's problem *must* be solved during his individual life, and often within the space of a few days, months or years—or he will be lost, *regardless of how rapidly the social trend sweeps on from one problem to another.*

Reincarnation and Responsibility

From the philosophical point of view, an objection sometimes raised against reincarnation is that it is "escapist" in motive. But this criticism can only arise from ignorance of its twin doctrine—the law of Karma. Reincarnation has no "philosophy" without the idea of continuous individual responsibility, from life to life. Thus, reincarnation provides no refuge from the stress of current problems, but rather further opportunity for their ultimate solution. No greater cause of the popular irresponsibility of the times can be found than the idea of but one life on earth, and after that—extinction. The ramification of social problems on a large scale, of which Mr. Boddy speaks, is a collective illustration of the irresponsibility of the units which go to make up society. And if recent history is any guide, our problems are developing much faster than their solutions. One of the chief fallacies of modern social reconstruction is its neglect of human psychology. No "society," whether a family of two or three individuals, or an entire nation or race, can survive unless each individual maintains a responsible relationship to the well-being of the whole. All the "relief" in the world, public works programs provided by an inexhaustible national treasury, can do nothing, of themselves, to arouse the idea of responsibility. Just as a father can "spoil" his children, a government can indulge its citizens. This is not to ignore pressing needs which must be cared for. The eugenic solution of letting the patient die because he is unfit has no place in Theospohical philosophy. It points rather to the necessity of education as to the causes of suffering as an essential preventive measure in company

with the immediate palliative measures. Mr. Boddy points out that "the individual's problem *must* be solved during his individual life—or he will be lost." Manifestly, this is impossible. Within the experience of every man are countless examples of "lost" lives—individuals unable to remain afloat in the stormy sea of economic life. And this leaves out of account the numberless men and women who succumb to mental and moral hurricanes and to physical disease. What the world needs is sound moral philosophy. This is demonstrable on the basis that our social problems all have their fundamental origin in an immoral conception of the relation of the individual to the whole. A political philosophy which ignores this fact is opportunist in conception, futile in application. The doctrine of reincarnation—of hope and responsibility—offers a source of moral stamina to the suffering individual and alone can form the basis of a constructive national philosophy.

A Nazi Panacea

Major Erich Suchsland of the German aviation corps assumes the role of sociologist with the interesting observation that aerial warfare is good for the human race. (New York *Times,* March 7.) He expatiates the theory that beneficent bombs dropped on the crowded quarters of the slum districts of large cities serve to wipe out the under-nourished and under-privileged—whom he calls the least desirable type of humanity— thus freeing the race of an incubus. Purges of this kind, he holds, purify the germ plasm and lead to a general improvement of heredity. We quote from the *Times* writer:

> After an air raid there is always much pillaging and disorder for which anti-fascists and other human vermin are responsible. There will be fighting for the spoils, with the certainty that many of the looters will be shot down. Again there is cause for rejoicing.
>
> By the time the bombers have retired the survivors in the community are in a state of terror. The major regards this as a test of stamina. The "jumpy" ones, the emotionally and nervously unstable, will therefore reveal themselves. According to the major the productive capacity of these unfortunates is impaired, which causes him to throw up his cap and cheer.

Some Russian Criticism

Professor S. G. Levit of the Maxim Gorky Medico-Genetical Institute, Moscow, takes the major in hand and in a sharp letter published in the Eugenics Review pushes the argument to

its extreme. If air warfare is a genetic purge, so is any act of barbarism, the professor points out. "Thus, for example, spikes in the bed tend to eliminate weak backs. And in this more general form, we fear, the major's thesis is after all not so very unfamiliar, having been advanced by not a few of those unfortunates who have developed under specially comfortable (and hence really deplorable) conditions."

The logic of the Russian scientist is unanswerable. One might wish that the same clear perception were present in other Soviet expressions. For example, the New York *Herald-Tribune* of Jan. 3 contains the account of a disagreement among Russian geneticists, from which it appears that biological facts are being suppressed in favor of Communist dogmas:

THE MARXIST PAPACY

Those who hold fast to the gene and chromosome theory of inheritance and of body development and lack of equality between various races, types and individuals have been shown the displeasure of the Soviet authorities, while those who preach the doctrine that all men are equal are in official favor although the rest of the scientific world discredits their theory.

A world famous American scientist who recently visited many scientific institutes in the Soviet republic reported an intense official enthusiasm for scientific research. The scientists, however, are required to pass a great deal of their time in this promotion work and to remain away from their researches. He capped the climax, however, by stating that the Soviet biologists accept and teach the doctrine of organic evolution not because it is the best explanation of the observed facts but because it is in harmony with the Marxist doctrines. Testbooks in other languages are translated into Russian and *wherever desired rewritten to conform to Soviet doctrines.*

AND IN THE UNITED STATES—?

Commenting on this curious state of affairs, a New York *Times* editorial writer quotes Mussolini as having said that "A scientist must be a good Fascist before he is a good theoretical physicist or biologist." He continues with the suggestion that

Instead of railing at Stalin and Hitler for promulgating peculiar conceptions of the rôle of science in the State, perhaps we ought to take stock of ourselves. A Greek in the days of Pericles probably ran less risk of ostracism and punishment for holding unorthodox views than a professor in a democratic

university. The Greek who taught that the earth is round and that it revolved around the sun was not tried for heresy, but at least one American professor lost his post because he regarded the possibility of survival after death a fit subject for scientific experimentation. Luckily, human genetics stands upon a somewhat higher plane in this country than in Russia, but when we study the efforts of American experts on heredity to improve the stock by law it is clear that we, too, have our prejudices.

"Social Eugenics"

Under this title, Fred Hogue, a writer in the Los Angeles *Times* of March 14, urges the support of the Johnson Sterilization Bill before the California State Assembly. These are the arguments presented:

> The load of mental cases carried by the California hospitals, both public and private, is growing progressively heavier each year. The number doubles progressively every ten years; and it is depressing to learn that the number of mental cases in all California hospitals is greater than that of all others combined. The hospitals for the feeble-minded are now overcrowded, and there are hundreds of cases that should be receiving hospitalization in Los Angeles and adjacent counties that are left in surroundings that make them a menace to both themselves and the public because there is no place to which the judges can commit them.
>
> These cases cannot be sent to a reformatory because they are not wilful criminals; but only the State and county social workers know how many of them are breeding, and bringing into the world children who continue the baleful hereditary chain of the feeble-minded. Sterilizaton of these cases outside the hospitals would break this hereditary chain; but there is no provision for performing such operations, even at the request of the patients.
>
> Japan has reversed its former policy and now is taking vigorous governmental steps to check the increase of mental maladies. The present Diet has recommended a bill providing for sterilization of the insane, epileptics, confirmed alcoholics and persons of known criminal tendencies. The new law is not modeled on our California sterilization law, which has not kept abreast of the advances in this field of science; but on those now in effect in Germany and the Scandinavian countries.
>
> There are still groups in this country who oppose sterilization of persons carrying a proven mental strain of insanity and feeble-mindedness, who even feel that they should be permitted to continue to propagate their kind.

A "BALEFUL" IGNORANCE

Mr. Hogue's enthusiasm for sterilization as a specific for mental diseases is wholly without regard for the facts. An essay on "Eugenics in Practice" published in the London *Lancet* for June 2, 1934, provides an outline of the history of sterilization in California, which reveals the ignorance of the *Times'* writer's broad claims for this measure. He speaks of "the baleful hereditary chain of the feeble minded" and refers with scorn to those who "oppose sterilization of persons carrying a proven mental strain of insanity." The *Lancet* article points out that in California experience "the insane ordinarily propagate too little to increase the size of their group and . . . the parole-rate of mentally defective patients cannot be increased as a result of sterilization." We quote a summarizing paragraph:

> American experience of legal sterilization ought to provide exact material for study. Sterilization laws now exist in 26 States in the Union, and in four others—New York, New Jersey, Nevada, and North Carolina—similar laws have ceased to be operative. Up to Jan. 1st, 1933, a total of 16,066 operations had been performed under these laws, of which 8504, or 53 per cent, were done in California. During the calendar year 1933 a further 578 sterilizations were done in California, not including operation by private physicians on individuals at their own request. In the view of the Brock Committee no entirely independent review of the California results has been attempted, and they find it significant that the parole rate in California institutions is equalled by the parole rate in a large mental deficiency colony in a State which had no sterilization law. The committee consider that, while there is no evidence of harm done by sterilization, nothing practical has really been done either.

Thus, Mr. Hogue would have a bigger and better sterilization law which would accomplish "nothing practical" on a much larger scale. The *Lancet* article notes that "In general, it was found that no large group of institutional insane in California would produce enough children wholly to reproduce themselves even if the members of the group were all unsterilized." It seems that some other cause than this must be sought to account for the increase of insanity in California.

A HIGHER "AUTHORITY" SPEAKS

It is surprising that a journalist like Mr. Hogue who presumes to write from the "scientific viewpoint" should exhibit such dogmatic assurance in support of so dubious a cause. Still more surprising

is it that so prominent a man as Prof. Ernest Hooton, Harvard anthropologist, should offer the same solution for the general salvation of society (New York *Times*, Feb. 28). He says that in the past 25,000 years during which man has inhabited Europe, the race has made no anatomical advance. On the contrary, he presents instances of serious degeneration. We quote the *Times*:

> Jaws, for example, are malformed. "A horrible process of decay has infected the teeth," with the result that germs develop which infect the nose, throat and ears and sometimes run riot through the whole body. The bones of the nose are so constricted that many of us are mouth-breathers, hence germ inhalers.
>
> Primitive people are healthier than we. Perhaps the explanation may be a simpler diet. "As long as man has to eat everything which he can find and masticate, he seems to maintain his organic equilibrium," observes Professor Hooton. "As soon as he begins to command enough food to be able to pick and choose, he eats too much of the same foods and suffers from malnutrition."
>
> In the city diseases multiply. In fact, a high state of cultural development means a lowering of physical standards. This would not be so bad if our minds improved. But they don't, Professor Hooton insists. The geneticists have demonstrated clearly enough that healthy minds are found in healthy bodies, as a rule.

In Lieu of Altruism

The anthropologist admits that if all men were of the same intellectual caliber and possessed equally high altruistic motives, there would be no problem. But since this is not the case he asks for a "a sit-down reproductive strike of the busy breeders among the morons, criminals and social ineffectuals of our population." The comments which follow are written by Waldemar Kaempffert, the *Times* science editor. His genuinely scientific analysis of the problem is so valuable that we reproduce it in full:

> This [Prof. Hooton's prescription] has a familiar ring. The eugenists have been giving us the same advice these fifty years or more.
>
> Professor Hooton ought to read the reports on eugenic sterilization prepared for Parliament and for the American Psychiatric Association. From these it appears that it would take about sixty generations to get rid of the hereditary feeble-

minded even if we spotted the carriers of bad genes as fast as they appeared. Besides, the mentally incompetent do not reproduce themselves rapidly enough to maintain their kind. We all carry defective genes. No one can tell when a case of insanity or feeble-mindedness may not break out in the best of families.

A Few Impartial Facts

"Lobster claw" (an abnormality in which the hand is reduced to one thumb and one finger) can be wiped out in one generation by sterilization. Hereditary night-blindness, diabetes insipidus and stubby abnormal fingers are also eradicated. But when a defect is handed down to only half the progeny without skipping a generation sterilization is mere guesswork. To weed out such diseases as hereditary brittleness of bones (always accompanied by eye-whites that are blue-gray and frequently by deafness), pre-senile cataract, glaucoma, Huntington's chorea (a terrible affliction of the nervous system which often ends in insanity), we must wait until the disease has appeared. By that time children may have been born. These, too, would have to be sterilized. Hemophilia, the "bleeding sickness," touches only the males, but is transmitted through the females. It would be necessary to sacrifice all the females of the family as well as the males.

These are only a few of the hereditary diseases that present baffling problems to the advocate of sterilization. Hence both the British and American committees wisely restrict their recommendations to a few of the more flagrant cases. Too little is known as yet about genes and the combinations into which they enter to justify the kind of wholesale sterilization for which Professor Hooton cheers.

There is also the question of reasons. We say that sterilization is desirable, even necessary, on "social" grounds. What do you mean by "social"? It turns out that many eugenists mean "economic" grounds. But suppose we change our society and submit to fascism or communism and thus do away with the profit motive. It may well be that our sterilizing standards would be different.

All sterilizers are animated by the desire to preserve and improve society. But what kind of society? The question is important. It cannot be wholly separated from biological considerations.